

bulletin





The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XVIII, No. 466 • PUBLICATION 3168

June 6, 1948

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

SUBSCRIPTION:
52 issues, \$5; single copy, 15 cents

Published with the approval of the
Director of the Bureau of the Budget

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

D
UNITED

Geno
ECO

Comp

The
referr
resolu
Counc
name
China
Soviet
Venez
to the
Depar
Kathe
and M
Justic

Terms

The
Counc
"TH
TAR
Resol

Est
the fo
Counc
State
public

Ins

(a)
Natio
on th
above
sembl
gethe
sion o
of the
(b)

tio
prepa
of the
tion,
any M

Re
priat
to ca

June

6-22-48

Genocide: Report of the U.S. Representative on ECOSOC Committee¹

Composition of the Committee

The *ad hoc* Committee on Genocide, hereinafter referred to as the Committee, was established by resolution no. 117(VI) of the Economic and Social Council, March 3, 1948. The following states were named by the resolution to serve on the Committee: China, France, Lebanon, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, and Venezuela. The Delegation of the United States to the Committee consisted of John Maktos, of the Department of State, Representative, and Miss Katherine B. Fite, of the Department of State, and Mr. A. Abbot Rosen, of the Department of Justice, Advisers.

Terms of Reference of the Committee

The resolution of the Economic and Social Council of March 3, 1948, reads as follows:

"The Economic and Social Council,

TAKING COGNIZANCE of the General Assembly Resolution No. 180(II) of 23 November 1947.

Establishes an Ad Hoc Committee composed of the following Members of the Economic and Social Council: China, France, Lebanon, Poland, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Venezuela.

Instructs the Committee:

(a) to meet at the Headquarters of the United Nations in order to prepare the draft Convention on the Crime of Genocide, in accordance with the above-mentioned resolution of the General Assembly, and to submit this draft convention, together with the recommendation of the Commission on Human Rights thereon to the next session of the Economic and Social Council; and,

(b) to take into consideration in the preparation of the draft convention, the draft convention prepared by the Secretary-General, the comments of the Member Governments on this draft convention, and other drafts on the matter submitted by any Member Government;

Requests the Secretary-General to take appropriate measures to enable the Committee effectively to carry out the tasks entrusted to it."

Preceding Resolutions of the General Assembly

On December 11, 1946, the General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution to the following effect:

"Genocide is a denial of the right of existence of entire human groups, as homicide is the denial of the right to live of individual human beings; such denial of the right of existence shocks the conscience of mankind, results in great losses to humanity in the form of cultural and other contributions represented by these human groups, and is contrary to moral law and to the spirit and aims of the United Nations.

Many instances of such crimes of genocide have occurred when racial, religious, political and other groups have been destroyed, entirely or in part.

The punishment of the crime of genocide is a matter of international concern.

The General Assembly therefore,

Affirms that genocide is a crime under international law which the civilized world condemns, and for the commission of which principals and accomplices—whether private individuals, public officials or statesmen, and whether the crime is committed on religious, racial, political or any other grounds—are punishable;

Invites the Member States to enact the necessary legislation for the prevention and punishment of this crime;

Recommends that international co-operation be organized between States with a view to facilitating the speedy prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, and, to this end,

Requests the Economic and Social Council to undertake the necessary studies, with a view to drawing up a draft convention on the crime of genocide to be submitted to the next regular session of the General Assembly."

A further resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on November 23, 1947, stating:

"The General Assembly,

REALIZING the importance of the problem of combating the international crime of genocide;

REAFFIRMING its resolution 96(I) of 11 December 1946 on the crime of genocide;

DECLARING that genocide is an international crime entailing national and international responsibility on the part of individuals and States;

¹ U.N. doc. E/704, May 24, 1948.

NOTING that a large majority of the Governments of Members of the United Nations have not yet submitted their observations on the draft Convention on the crime of genocide prepared by the Secretariat and circulated to those Governments by the Secretary-General on 7 July 1947;

CONSIDERING that the Economic and Social Council has stated in its resolution of 6 August 1947 that it proposes to proceed as rapidly as possible with the consideration of the question of genocide, subject to any further instructions which it may receive from the General Assembly,

Requests the Economic and Social Council to continue the work it has begun concerning the suppression of the crime of genocide, including the study of the draft Convention prepared by the Secretariat, and to proceed with the completion of a convention, taking into account that the International Law Commission, which will be set up in due course in accordance with General Assembly resolution 174(II) of 21 November 1947, has been charged with the formulation of the principles recognized in the Charter of the Nurnberg Tribunal, as well as the preparation of a draft code of offences against peace and security;

*Inform*s the Economic and Social Council that it need not await the receipt of the observations of all Members before commencing its work; and

Requests the Economic and Social Council to submit a report and the Convention on this question to the third regular session of the General Assembly."

History of the Committee's Work

The first meeting of the Committee was held on April 5, 1948, at Lake Success. The Committee continued to sit through May 10, 1948.

The United States Representative was elected chairman of the Committee, the Soviet Representative, vice-chairman, and the Lebanese Representative, rapporteur.

The Committee, upon the motion of the Soviet Representative, voted that before proceeding to the actual drafting of a convention on genocide, it would discuss and make preliminary decisions on ten basic principles outlined in a paper presented by the Soviet Representative. (U.N. doc. E/AC.25/7.) After a discussion of the principles, the Committee proceeded to the actual work of drafting.

A special subcommittee was elected by the Committee to draft the formal articles of the treaty (articles 11 through 19). The subcommittee consisted of the Representatives of the United States, as chairman, Poland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The articles prepared by the subcommittee were adopted by the Committee substantially as drafted.

To aid it in its work, the Committee had before it a draft convention on genocide prepared by the

Secretariat of the United Nations (U.N. doc. E/447), a draft convention submitted by the French Government (U.N. doc. E/623/Add.1), a draft convention circulated informally by the Soviet Representative, and a draft convention submitted by the United States on September 30, 1947 (U.N. doc. E/623, pp. 35-40). It was pointed out by the United States Representative that it had been specifically stated in the United States Mission's press release no. 376 of February 10, 1948, that this draft did "not represent the final position of the United States Government".

The Committee at first decided to give priority to no one text, but later decided to use as a basis of discussion a draft text submitted by the Chinese Representative. (U.N. doc. E/AC.25/9.)

The draft convention finally agreed upon is attached as annex A. The text of the convention as a whole was adopted by a vote of 5 to 1 (the U.S.S.R. dissenting), with 1 abstention (Poland).

Summary of the Draft Convention

Briefly stated, the draft convention declares genocide to be a crime under international law (article 1), and defines it in terms of "deliberate acts committed with the intent to destroy a national, racial, religious or political group, on grounds of the national or racial origin, religious belief, or political opinion of its members" (article 2). In other words, to fall within the category of genocide, an act must have the above specified intent and motive. The "deliberate acts" are listed as:

- "(1) killing members of the group;
- "(2) impairing the physical integrity of members of the group;
- "(3) inflicting on members of the group measures or conditions of life aimed at causing their deaths;
- "(4) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group."

Article 3 defines so-called "cultural genocide" as any deliberate act committed with the intent to destroy the language, religion, or culture of a national, racial, or religious group on grounds of the national or racial or religious belief of its members, such as:

- "(1) prohibiting the use of the language of the group in daily intercourse or in schools, or the printing and circulation of publications in the language of the group;
- "(2) destroying or preventing the use of libraries, museums, schools, historical monuments, places of worship or other cultural institutions and objects of the group."

In article 4, not only genocide, but also conspiracy, attempt, and direct public or private in-

Comments on the Draft Convention

The United States Representative opposed the inclusion of so-called "cultural genocide" in the convention (article 3), feeling that the subject should more properly be taken up in connection with the protection of minorities. He stated that the act of creating the new crime of genocide was one of extreme gravity, and the United States felt that the convention should be confined to those barbarous acts directed against individuals which form the basic concept of public opinion on this subject. The French Representative, not being satisfied with the formula worked out in article 3, also opposed its inclusion.

The United States Representative was also opposed to the inclusion of "direct incitement" as a punishable act under article 4. He stated that incitement to commit genocide should be punishable only so far as it constituted "attempt" or "conspiracy" (which are made punishable under the same article), but that incitement to commit genocide should not be separately listed as a punishable offence.

ANNEX A: DRAFT CONVENTION ON GENOCIDE**As adopted by the Ad Hoc Committee on Genocide²****PREAMBLE**

The High Contracting Parties,

DECLARING that genocide is a grave crime against mankind which is contrary to the spirit and aim of the United Nations and which the civilized world condemns;

HAVING BEEN PROFOUNDLY SHOCKED by many recent instances of genocide;

HAVING TAKEN NOTE of the fact that the International Military Tribunal at Nurnberg in its judgment of September 30th-October 1st 1946 has punished under a different legal description certain persons who have committed acts similar to those which the present Convention aims at punishing, and

BEING CONVINCED that the prevention and punishment of genocide requires international cooperation,

Hereby agree to prevent and punish the crime as herein-after provided:

Article I

(Genocide: a crime under international law)

Genocide is a crime under international law whether committed in time of peace or in time of war.

Article II

("Physical" and "biological" genocide)

In this Convention genocide means any of the following deliberate acts committed with the intent to destroy a national, racial, religious or political group, on grounds of the national or racial origin, religious belief, or political opinion of its members:

- (1) killing members of the group;

- (2) impairing the physical integrity of members of the group;

- (3) inflicting on members of the group measures or conditions of life aimed at causing their deaths;

- (4) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group.

Article III

("Cultural" genocide)

In this Convention genocide also means any deliberate act committed with the intent to destroy the language, religion, or culture of a national, racial or religious group on grounds of the national or racial origin or religious belief of its members such as:

- (1) prohibiting the use of the language of the group in daily intercourse or in schools, or the printing and circulation of publications in the language of the group;

- (2) destroying or preventing the use of libraries, museums, schools, historical monuments, places of worship or other cultural institutions and objects of the group.

Article IV

(Punishable acts)

The following acts shall be punishable:

- (a) genocide as defined in Articles II and III;
- (b) conspiracy to commit genocide;
- (c) direct incitement in public or in private to commit genocide whether such incitement be successful or not;

² The notes in parentheses placed before the articles which indicate the subject dealt with therein are not intended to be part of the convention.

UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

- (d) attempt to commit genocide;
- (e) complicity in any of the acts enumerated in this article.

Article V (Persons liable)

Those committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article IV shall be punished whether they are Heads of State, public officials or private individuals.

Article VI (Domestic legislation)

The High Contracting Parties undertake to enact the necessary legislation in accordance with their constitutional procedures to give effect to the provisions of this Convention.

Article VII (Jurisdiction)

Persons charged with genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article IV shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the State in the territory of which the act was committed or by a competent international tribunal.

Article VIII (Action of the United Nations)

1. A party to this Convention may call upon any competent organ of the United Nations to take such action as may be appropriate under the Charter for the prevention and suppression of genocide.
2. A party to this Convention may bring to the attention of any competent organ of the United Nations any case of violation of this Convention.

Article IX (Extradition)

1. Genocide and the other acts enumerated in Article IV shall not be considered as political crimes and therefore shall be grounds for extradition.
2. Each party to this Convention pledges itself to grant extradition in such cases in accordance with its laws and treaties in force.

Article X (Settlement of disputes by the International Court of Justice)

Disputes between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice provided that no dispute shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice involving an issue which has been referred to and is pending before or has been passed upon by a competent international criminal tribunal.

FINAL CLAUSES

Article XI (Languages, date of the Convention)

The present Convention of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic shall bear the date of . . .

¹The dates for the time limits will have to be filled in according to the date of the adoption of the Convention by the General Assembly.

Article XII

(States eligible to become parties to the Convention
Means of becoming a party)

1. The present Convention shall be open until 31 . . . 194 . . . ¹ for signature on behalf of any Members of the United Nations and of any non-member State to which an invitation to sign has been addressed by the General Assembly.

The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. After 1 . . . 194 . . . ¹ the present Convention may be acceded to on behalf of any Member of the United Nations and of any non-member State that has received an invitation as aforesaid.

Instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article XIII

(Coming into force of the Convention)

1. The present Convention shall come into force on the ninetieth day following the receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations of not less than twenty instruments of ratification or accession.
2. Ratification or accession received after the Convention has come into force shall become effective as from the ninetieth day following the date of deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article XIV

(Duration of the Convention—Denunciation)

1. The present Convention shall remain in effect for a period of five years dating from its entry into force.
2. It shall remain in force for further successive periods of five years for such Contracting Parties that have not denounced it at least six months before the expiration of the current period.
3. Denunciation shall be effected by a written notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article XV

(Abrogation of the Convention)

Should the number of Parties to this Convention become less than sixteen as a result of denunciations, the Convention shall cease to have effect as from the date on which the last of these denunciations shall become operative.

Article XVI

(Revision of the Convention)

1. Upon receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations of written communications from one-fourth of the number of High Contracting Parties, requesting consideration of the revision of the present Convention and the transmission of the respective requests to the General Assembly, the Secretary-General shall transmit such communications to the General Assembly.
2. The General Assembly shall decide upon the steps if any, to be taken in respect of such requests.

Article XVII

(Notifications by the Secretary-General)

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall notify all Members of the United Nations and non-member States referred to in Article XII of all signatures, ratifications and accessions received in accordance with Articles XII and XIII, of the date upon which the present Convention has come into force, of denunciations received in accordance with Article XIV.

Department of State Bulletin

UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

ance with Article XIV of the abrogation of the Convention effected as provided by Article XV and of requests for revision of the Convention made in accordance with Article XVI.

Article XVIII

(Deposit of the original of the Convention and transmission of copies to Governments)

1. The original of this Convention shall be deposited in the Archives of the United Nations.

2. A certified copy thereof shall be transmitted to all Members of the United Nations and to the non-member States referred to under Article XII.

Article XIX

(Registration of the Convention)

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the date of its coming into force.

Accomplishments of UNESCO¹

BY GEORGE V. ALLEN

Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs

Three years ago the representatives of 50 nations, assembled in this city, signed the Charter of the United Nations. One of the aims of this Charter, as stated in its provisions, was "To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion . . ."

UNESCO is part and parcel of the international intergovernmental system of the United Nations. UNESCO must be the last inner sanctuary of those forces working to find a basis, through education and honest cooperation among peoples, for a lasting and just peace.

While the central objective of UNESCO is the same as that of the United Nations, the special province of UNESCO is to promote collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture.

UNESCO's contribution to this central objective will be made slowly, perhaps almost imperceptibly, for such, in general, is the nature of education and of cultural and scientific collaboration.

We must avoid confusion on this point. UNESCO has an immediate program—indeed, many programs. In every project, steps can be taken at once, some targets can be reached soon. But let us keep constantly in mind the long-range objective and not be distracted from the patient, constructive labors to which UNESCO summons us.

UNESCO is not directly concerned with the resolution of many of the immediate political and economic issues of the world, even though most of these issues will inevitably find some reflections in our deliberations. UNESCO's unique function is rather to mobilize the forces of education, science, and culture for the ultimate establishment of a free and peaceful world community.

The conviction that a free and peaceful world community can be achieved does not yet have

strong roots in the minds of men. UNESCO's job is to enrich the soil and help strengthen the roots. Like good gardeners, we must go on with that spade work, without looking for miracles of rapid fruition, and undeterred by fears of drouth or blight.

UNESCO is a small organization with a large job. If you could see UNESCO in action it would look something like this. In an old hotel in Paris, about 400 people are at work. While they are engaged in a tremendous enterprise, they are spending only about seven million dollars a year. In one room a former school superintendent from Poland is gathering information about the destruction of schools and laboratories and libraries in the war-devastated countries. A Frenchman in another office is studying the needs in those same countries for radio sets and film projectors and newsprint.

Reports are coming to them from field staffs in Europe and China, Burma, the Philippines, and other countries ravaged by war.

In another office at UNESCO House, Professor James Quillen, of Stanford, is preparing suggestions which will come back to educators in this country and in all the member states on ways in which textbooks and teaching materials can be improved so as to contribute to international understanding.

At the same time UNESCO will be promoting the publication of books which explain national traditions and viewpoints of its member states to one another.

In another corner of UNESCO House you would see three or four men busily drawing up suggestions for radio scripts and for educational films which will be submitted to producers in each country. These programs and films emphasize themes of human cooperation, and the common heritage of the arts and sciences of mankind.

¹Excerpts from an address made before the Pacific Regional Conference on UNESCO at San Francisco on May 13, 1948, and released to the press on the same date.

These are but a few illustrations of UNESCO at work.

UNESCO's work originates in UNESCO House, but in its accomplishment it draws upon the educational and intellectual resources of all its member nations. UNESCO House is a physical center of international cooperation. It provides what has never existed before—a continuing home for international conferences of educators and scientists and scholars. It provides such humdrum, but indispensable, services as conference rooms, secretarial staff, and interpreters. It is a meeting point and a growing point for the international mind.

One of UNESCO's activities is international communication. This embraces the international use of radio and films and press; the free flow of ideas across national boundaries; the interchange of books; and the development of public libraries. We seek to destroy any barriers to the freest flow of information and thought between nations. We seek, moreover, to prevent the great instruments of mass communications from being manipulated in order to warp the minds of men.

An incident which occurred in Poland recently illustrates the unfortunate barriers to the free interchange of information which exist. In our Embassy in Warsaw, we have an information office where Polish citizens may obtain information about the United States—texts of speeches made in the United States and of editorials published in the American press. A few days ago, the Polish Government promptly began to detain for questioning any Poles who visited our information office. A high Polish official declared that the American Embassy in Warsaw was placing Polish citizens in jeopardy by making information available to them!

I am glad to point out that copies of *Izvestia* and *Pravda* are sold alongside the *Wall Street Journal* on the newsstands of New York. Volumes by Karl Marx and Adolf Hitler are found alongside the works of Voltaire and Rousseau on library shelves throughout this country.

The UNESCO effort to increase communication among nations embraces not only the interchange of ideas but also of persons. UNESCO seeks the widest flow of students, scholars, and cultural leaders among the nations of the world, in all directions.

There are now approximately 20,000 foreign students in the United States and about half as many Americans abroad. It is my view that the United States, in keeping with the principles of UNESCO, should always ask to keep open the door for the widest interchange of visits between Americans and the people of every other country. I would not be warranted in leading you to expect that the interchange of persons with eastern Europe is likely to increase in the near future, either under UNESCO or any other program. The Ameri-

can Embassy in Moscow, watchful for any indication that the Soviet authorities might relax the adamant attitude they had previously shown, was prompt to renew various suggestions for cultural interchanges which had long been pending. One was a suggestion that the conductor of the Moscow Symphony Orchestra might serve as a guest conductor in Boston. However, this subject, like numerous others we had been pressing, has continued to fall on entirely deaf ears. Nor was any invitation obtained for an American conductor to visit Moscow.

This is merely one of dozens of efforts which have been made by the American Government consistently for the past 15 years. Nonetheless, we should continue to be eager to take advantage of any opportunity which others may make possible for the widest exchange of visitors or students with any nation which shows any inclination to permit it. We must do so if we remain loyal to our UNESCO pledge.

The question is often asked, "What has UNESCO actually accomplished up to the present time?" Our aims are high, but have we done anything concrete? While UNESCO's accomplishments are not all that we could hope for, we are able to report tangible results.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven was the first year of operations for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Much of its work during this first year was the exploration and planning which are indispensable preliminary steps in any significant international enterprise. Even so there were some real accomplishments in this initial year. For example:

UNESCO sent trained investigators to 6 countries and questionnaires to 14, to compile information on needs in educational, scientific, and cultural reconstruction. Findings were published in newsletters and the *Book of Needs*.

UNESCO stimulated member countries to help meet these needs. Typical examples of gifts: 300 sets of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (United States of America); 25,000 copies of classics (France); 5,000 maps, 700 sets of periodicals, 450 pamphlets (South Africa); 250,000 textbooks (Junior Red Cross of California, for Philippines); 1,000,000 pencils (San Francisco Campfire Girls); school stationery, books, and clothing (Swiss school children, for Greece).

Training fellowships are being contributed by Belgium (5), France (20), British Film Producers (10), American Chemical Society (10), Phi Delta Kappa (1), Rotary International (2), New Zealand (\$75,000), Australia (\$200,000).

UNESCO has very little money to spend itself on direct aid, but has established 62 UNESCO scholar-

(Continued on page 730)

Security Council Action on Palestine

Cease-Fire Order¹

The Security Council

TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION that previous resolutions of the Security Council in respect to Palestine have not been complied with and that military operations are taking place in Palestine;

Calls upon all Governments and authorities, without prejudice to the rights, claims or position of the parties concerned, to abstain from any hostile military action in Palestine and to that end to issue a cease-fire order to their military and paramilitary forces to become effective within thirty-six hours after midnight New York standard time, 22 May 1948;

Calls upon the Truce Commission and upon all parties concerned to give the highest priority to the negotiation and maintenance of a truce in the City of Jerusalem;

Directs the Truce Commission established by the Security Council by its resolution of 23 April 1948² to report to the Security Council on the compliance with the two preceding paragraphs of this resolution;

Calls upon all parties concerned to facilitate by all means in their power the task of the United Nations Mediator appointed in execution of the resolution of the General Assembly of 14 May 1948.

Four-Week Truce³

The Security Council,

DESIRING to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Palestine without prejudice to the rights, claims and position of either Arabs or Jews,

Calls upon all Governments and authorities concerned to order a cessation of all acts of armed force for a period of four weeks,

Calls upon all Governments and authorities concerned to undertake that they will not introduce fighting personnel into Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Trans-Jordan and Yemen during the cease fire and

Calls upon all Governments and authorities concerned, should men of military age be introduced into countries or territories under their control, to undertake not to mobilize or submit them to military training during the cease fire,

Calls upon all Governments and authorities concerned to refrain from importing or exporting war material into or to Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Trans-Jordan and Yemen during the cease fire,

June 6, 1948

Urges all Governments and authorities concerned to take every possible precaution for the protection of the holy places and of the City of Jerusalem, including access to all shrines and sanctuaries for the purpose of worship by those who have an established right to visit and worship at them,

Instructs the United Nations Mediator for Palestine, in concert with the Truce Commission, to supervise the observance of the above provisions, and *decides* that they shall be provided with a sufficient number of military observers.

Instructs the United Nations Mediator to make contact with all parties as soon as the cease fire is enforced with a view to carrying out his functions as determined by the General Assembly.

Calls upon all concerned to give the greatest possible assistance to the United Nations Mediator,

Instructs the United Nations Mediator to make a weekly report to the Security Council during the cease fire,

Invites the states members of the Arab League and the Jewish and Arab authorities in Palestine to communicate their acceptance of this resolution to the Security Council not later than 6.00 p.m., New York Standard Time, on 1 June 1948,

Decides that if the present resolution is rejected by either party or by both, or if, having been accepted, it is subsequently repudiated or violated, the situation in Palestine will be reconsidered with a view to action under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Calls upon all Governments to take all possible steps to assist in the implementation of this resolution.

U.S. Asks Jewish and Arab States To Cooperate in Cease-Fire Order

[Released to the press May 24]

The Department on May 24 telegraphed the chiefs of the American Missions in Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and the Yemen directing them to approach either the Chief of State or the Foreign Minister in the country to which each is accredited to say that the United States Government is gravely disturbed at the present course of developments in Palestine and that the United States Government hopes that the

¹ U.N. doc. S/773, May 22, 1948. Resolution adopted at the 302d meeting of the Security Council on May 22.

² BULLETIN of May 9, 1948, p. 594.

³ U.N. doc. S/801, May 29, 1948. Resolution adopted by the Security Council on May 29, 1948.

government to which he is accredited will, as a fellow member of the United Nations, give full cooperation in respect to the cease-fire resolution adopted May 22 by the Security Council.

The Department followed this action by telegraphing similar instructions to the American Vice Consul in charge of the Consulate General in Jerusalem, William C. Burdett, to approach the Government of Transjordan.

The appeal of the United States Government was taken unilaterally and follows numerous representations made on the question of Palestine to both the Arab states and Jewish leaders.

Current United Nations Documents: A Selected Bibliography¹

- Official Records, First Year, Second Session. Special Supplement No. 2. Summary Records of the Meetings of the Committee of the Whole on Refugees and Displaced Persons. 64 pp. printed. [70¢.]
- Second Year, Fifth Session. Supplement No. 4. Report of the Second Session of the Economic and Employment Commission. [E/445 and E/445/Add. 1] 21 pp. printed. [20¢.]
- Supplement No. 5. Commission on Human Rights, Report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press. [E/441 and E/441/Add. 1] 16 pp. printed. [20¢.]
- Supplement No. 6. Report of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and Report of the Committee of the Whole. [E/452 and E/491] 27 pp. printed. [30¢.]
- Supplement No. 1. Report of the Commission on Human Rights. [E/600] 59 pp. printed. [60¢.]
- Index to the Resolutions of the Economic and Social Council. First to Fifth Sessions Inclusive, 1946-1947. E/INF/20, Feb. 18, 1948. 53 pp. mimeo.
- Composition of the Economic and Social Council and Subsidiary Organs. E/INF/21, Feb. 4, 1948. 18 pp. mimeo.

THE CONGRESS

Fascism in Action: A Documented Study and Analysis of Fascism in Europe. H. Doc. 401, 80th Cong., 1st sess. II, 206 pp.

The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism: Supplement I, One Hundred Years of Communism, 1848-1948; Supplement II, Official Protests of the United States Government Against Communist Policies or Actions, and Related Correspondence. H. Doc. 619, 80th Cong., 2d sess. IV, 129 pp.

Loan to the United Nations to Finance Construction of Permanent Headquarters in the United States: Message from the President of the United States, transmitting an agreement between the United States and the United Nations concerning a loan of \$65,000,000, without interest, to be made by the United States to the United Nations to finance the construction of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States. H. Doc. 595, 80th Cong., 2d sess. 4 pp.

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York City. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

UNESCO—Continued from page 728

ships, and has furnished 50 sets of scientific apparatus to technical schools, at a cost of \$75,000.

UNESCO has also published a useful handbook of suggestions to teachers in devastated countries, *The Teacher and the Postwar Child*. This is so useful that the United States Office of Military Government in Germany has translated and published it.

UNESCO held its first international summer school for teachers on ways of teaching to promote international understanding. Eighty-two of the world's best teachers, from 31 countries, took part in this 6-week summer school. A pamphlet has been published describing the summer school, *Unesco in Action*.

UNESCO has also pushed ahead the ambitious project for the scientific investigation of the tropical basin of the Amazon; an international conference at Belém, Pará, Brazil, drew up plans for this long-term project. Moreover, UNESCO has established three regional centers, in Cairo, Rio de Janeiro, and Nanking. These field science cooperation offices are centers for promoting contacts and exchange of scientific information among scientists in isolated areas.

Negotiations have been started for establishing demonstration ("pilot") projects in fundamental education in Haiti, British East Africa, and China.

The faith in which UNESCO was created is the faith which animates us today.

There are governments of both the right and left today which reject the free spirit of inquiry and the free meeting of minds. Some of these countries have never joined UNESCO. Others which joined UNESCO have since fallen under the domination of dictatorial governments. In these circumstances what are the prospects for UNESCO's success?

No man can predict or promise success. Our efforts cannot be conditioned upon guaranties that we shall succeed.

We do not fear to meet the representative of any country in any international forum. UNESCO is an international forum where speech is free.

We recognize that a forum is also a battleground of ideas; we go prepared not merely to defend, but to advance our principles with all the force and vigor we command.

We have charted a course of international cooperation. The pursuit of that course is fraught with difficulties. The conduct of policy presents us with no easy questions and admits of no easy answers. These are public questions. It is for the peoples of the world to clarify and formulate a truly public answer.

The United States in the United Nations

[Lake Success, May 28 to June 3, 1948]

Palestine

The Security Council agreed on June 2 that Arab and Jewish replies to its May 29 call for a four-week cease-fire constituted unconditional acceptance. It decided that the U.N. mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden, should make arrangements on the scene for institution of the cease-fire. On June 3 the Council agreed that discussion of control machinery for the cease-fire, such as provision of neutral military observers, should await receipt of Count Bernadotte's first weekly report.

Ambassador Austin told the Council that the U.S. would give the mediator its full support in measures to implement the cease-fire and to work out a peaceful settlement in line with the General Assembly's resolution of May 14. He suggested that three days should be enough time to fix the hour for the cease-fire period to begin.

Mr. Austin said he hoped that Count Bernadotte could stress, during the four weeks, that part of the General Assembly resolution which authorized him to call on U.N. specialized agencies and other nonpolitical bodies for aid in advancing the economic and social welfare of Palestinians.

The Council's May 29 resolution was based on a draft proposed by the U.K. It was approved by an 8-0 vote (Syria, U.S.S.R., and Ukraine abstaining) after rejection of a U.S.S.R. draft, based on chapter VII of the Charter (peace enforcement), which would "order" the parties to end hostilities. The U.S. supported the U.S.S.R. proposal, Mr. Austin pointing out that it was similar to one he had made on May 17. It met the same fate, receiving the same five votes (Colombia, France, Ukraine, U.S.S.R., U.S.), two short of the required seven.

The U.K. draft was much amended before passage. Nine amendments put forward by Mr. Austin were accepted, as were others proposed by Canada, France, the Jewish Agency, and the Arab Higher Committee. In final form the resolution, although grounded in the conciliation principles of the Charter's chapter VI, warns that if the cease-fire is not effective "the situation in Palestine will be reconsidered with a view to action under chapter VII".¹

The reply of the Provisional Government of

Israel, received June 1, based its acceptance of the cease-fire on five "assumptions". The Arab League reply, transmitted June 2, accepted in the light of certain "explanations". In both cases the qualifications were chiefly concerned with interpretation of the resolution's provisions governing importation of arms and fighting personnel during the cease-fire period.

Atomic Energy

On June 2 the Security Council received the Third Report of the Atomic Energy Commission. Adopted on May 17 by a 9-2 vote (U.S.S.R., Ukraine), the report says that the Commission has "reached an impasse" because the Soviet Union will not "agree to even those elements of effective control considered essential from the technical point of view, let alone their acceptance of the nature and extent of participation in the world community required of all nations in this field by the first and second reports of the Atomic Energy Commission."

The Third Report is submitted to the Security Council for consideration and transmittal, together with the two previous reports to the General Assembly as "a matter of special concern".

The report states that "this situation" is beyond the competence of the Commission and recommends that negotiations at the Commission level be suspended until the General Assembly finds "that this situation no longer exists" or until the Commission's six permanent members (Canada, China, France, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S.) "find that there exists a basis for agreement on the international control of atomic energy."

The Soviet Union flatly rejects the majority plan on the ground that it constitutes an unwarranted infringement of international sovereignty.

The Commission's majority "is fully aware of the impact of its plan on traditional prerogatives of national sovereignty," the report adds, "but in the face of the realities of the problem it sees no alternative to the voluntary sharing by nations of their sovereignty in this field".

The report notes that the majority plan is a "substantial achievement" in that it will serve as the basis of any further discussion of this subject". The majority plan calls for an international agency, established by treaty, which would

¹For text of the resolution, see *ante*, p. 729.

control in some degree all phases of atomic-energy activities and have broad powers of inspection to prevent clandestine activities. The plan specifies in great detail the powers and functions of the control agency.

Referring to the insistence of the Soviet Union that a convention outlawing atomic weapons and providing for destruction of existing weapons must precede any control agreement, the report asserts that the Commission's majority "considered that such a convention, without safeguards, would offer no protection against non-compliance."

Annexes to the Third Report (U.N. doc. AEC/31) include a summary of the majority plan, the U.S.S.R. proposals, the analysis and rejection of the U.S.S.R. proposals which the Commission's Working Group adopted on April 5, 1948, and two speeches by Andrei Gromyko in rebuttal.

Kashmir

The Security Council's Commission on Kashmir, at an informal meeting May 28, decided to hold its first formal meeting in Geneva on June 15 and then to proceed to the Indian subcontinent. Charles P. Noyes, adviser to Ambassador Austin on Security Council and general affairs, represented the U.S. at the meeting.

The Commission's roster was completed June 2 by appointment of J. Klahr Huddle as U.S. Representative. Mr. Huddle, a veteran Foreign Service officer, is the first U.S. Ambassador to the Union of Burma.

On June 3 the Security Council voted to instruct the Commission not only to give priority to the India-Pakistan dispute over the affiliation of Kashmir and Jammu but also to investigate three other issues which are troubling the two countries' relations.

U.S. Representation

The Senate confirmed on June 1 the President's appointment of Philip C. Jessup to be Deputy U.S. Representative in the Security Council. He succeeds Herschel V. Johnson, who has been named Ambassador to Brazil. Dr. Jessup is on leave from Columbia University, where he has the Hamilton Fish chair of international law and diplomacy. Since January 1948, he has represented the U.S. in the Interim Committee of the General Assembly, a post he will continue to hold.

The President on May 28 named Joseph E. Johnson to be an additional Deputy Representative of the U.S. in the Interim Committee. Dr. Johnson, now professor of history at Williams College, was associated with the Department of State from 1942 to 1947, participating in activities which led to the organization and early operation of the United Nations.

International Law Commission

Ambassador Austin notified Secretary-General Lie on June 1 that Manley O. Hudson is the U.S. national candidate for election to the U.N. International Law Commission. Nonnational candidates nominated by the U.S. are Alberto Ulloa Sotomayor of Peru and Jean Spyropoulos of Greece.

The 15-member Commission will be elected by the General Assembly at its next session from candidates nominated by member governments.

Dr. Hudson has been Bemis professor of international law at Harvard University since 1922. He was a member of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague from 1936 to 1940.

Mid-East Economic Commission

The U.N. will establish an Economic Commission for the Mid-East with membership restricted to the countries of the area, if the Economic and Social Council adopts a report (U.N. doc. E/AC.26/16) which a special committee forwarded to it on June 1.

During the six-week session of the committee the U.S. agreed to give up its claim to membership in the proposed commission provided that no other great power became a member. France, China and the U.K. took the same position, but the U.S.S.R. asserted that as a great power contiguous to the area it had a right to membership. The 11-nation committee rejected this view by a 10-1 vote.

Committee members represented China, Egypt, France, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Turkey, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S., and Venezuela. The U.S. member was Henry L. Deimel of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, Department of State.

Human Rights

Painstaking review of the draft Declaration of Human Rights occupied the Human Rights Commission during the first ten days of its third session, which began May 24. By June 3 the Commission, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, had completed its review of 11 of 33 articles in the draft prepared by its Drafting Committee during the first weeks of May.

At this session the Commission will also go over the draft of a Covenant of Human Rights. The Declaration is a statement of goals or standards of freedom for individuals. The Covenant is a treaty, to be ratified by the several nations, guaranteeing certain liberties to their nationals and residents.

The Commission plans to transmit both drafts together with recommendations on implementing the rights stated in the Covenant, to the Economic and Social Council before that parent body meets at Geneva on July 19.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of Meetings¹

Adjourned During May		1948
United Nations:		
Atomic Energy Commission	Lake Success	June 14, 1946- May 17, 1948
Commission for Palestine	Lake Success	Jan. 9-May 17
Ecosoc (Economic and Social Council):		
Economic and Employment Commission: Third Session	Lake Success	Apr. 19-May 6
Statistical Commission: Third Session	Lake Success	Apr. 26-May 7
Commission on Narcotic Drugs: Third Session	Lake Success	May 3-20
Population Commission: Third Session	Lake Success	May 10-
ECE (Economic Commission for Europe):		
Third Session	Geneva	Apr. 26-May 7
Committee on Electric Power	Geneva	May 10-
Panel on Housing	Geneva	May 13-15
Committee on Coal	Geneva	May 25-
Council of Foreign Ministers: Deputies for Austria	London	Feb. 20-May 24
First Meeting of Planning Committee on High Frequency Broadcasting	Geneva	Mar. 22-May 22
ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization):		
Rules of the Air and Air Traffic Control Practices Division	Montreal	Apr. 20-May 12
Second North Atlantic Regional Air Navigation Meeting	Paris	May 19-
International Administrative Aeronautical Radio Conference: Preparatory Conference	Geneva	Apr. 24-May 15
Conference To Plan for Establishment of an International Institute of Hylean Amazon	Iquitos, Peru	Apr. 30-May 10
Pan American Sanitary Organization: Meeting of Executive Committee	Washington	May 3-
UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization):		
International Teachers Organization	Paris	May 3-4
Committee of Experts for the Study of a Plan for Translations of Great Books	Paris	May 10-14
Meeting of Experts on Art and General Education	Geneva	May 11-15
ILO (International Refugee Organization): Sixth Part of First Session of Preparatory Commission	Geneva	May 4-
WHO (World Health Organization):		
Expert Committee for the Preparation of the Sixth Decennial Revision of the International Lists of Diseases and Causes of Death	Geneva	May 4-11
Expert Committee on Malaria: Second Session	Washington	May 19-25
First Meeting of South Pacific Commission	Sydney	May 10-
Fourth International Congresses on Tropical Medicine and Malaria	Washington	May 10-18
International Telegraph Consultative Committee	Brussels	May 10-29
International Administrative Aeronautical Radio Conference	Geneva	May 15-
Health Congress of the Royal Sanitary Institute	Harrogate, England	May 24-28
Sixth Meeting of the Caribbean Commission	San Juan, PR	May 24-29
In Session as of May 1, 1948		1946
Far Eastern Commission	Washington	Feb. 26-
United Nations:		
Security Council	Lake Success	Mar. 25-
Military Staff Committee	Lake Success	Mar. 25-

¹ Prepared in the Division of International Conferences, Department of State.

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

United Nations—Continued		1947
Commission on Conventional Armaments	Lake Success	Mar. 24–
Security Council's Committee of Good Offices on the Indonesian Question	Lake Success	Oct. 20–
General Assembly Special Committee on the Greek Question	Salonika	Nov. 21–
		1948
Temporary Commission on Korea	Seoul	Jan. 12–
Interim Committee of the General Assembly	Lake Success	Feb. 23–
General Assembly: Second Special Session on Palestine	Flushing Meadows	Apr. 16–
Ecosoc (Economic and Social Council): Human Rights Commission: Third Session	Lake Success	May 20–
		1946
German External Property Negotiations (Safehaven):		
With Portugal	Lisbon	Sept. 3–
With Spain	Madrid	Nov. 12–
		1947
Council of Foreign Ministers: Commission of Investigation to Former Italian Colonies	Former Italian Colonies	Nov. 8–
		1948
Provisional Frequency Board	Geneva	Jan. 15–
International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea	London	Apr. 23–
ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization):		
Second European-Mediterranean Regional Air Navigation Meeting	Paris	May 4–
Legal Committee: Annual Meeting	Geneva	May 28–
Scheduled for June 1-30, 1948		
ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization):		
Second Session of General Assembly	Geneva	June 1–
Conference of North Atlantic States Concerned in Joint Support of Iceland Air Navigation Services	Geneva	June 21–
United Nations:		
Ecosoc (Economic and Social Council):		
Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East: Third Session	Ootacamund, India	June 1–
Economic Commission for Latin America	Santiago	June 7–
Subcommission on Economic Development	Lake Success	June 14–
Permanent Central Opium Board: 50th Session	Geneva	June 14–
Trusteeship Council: Third Session	Lake Success	June 16–
Diplomatic Conference on Revision of Convention for Protection of Literary and Artistic Works	Brussels	June 5–19
Meeting of International Association for Hydraulic Structures Research	Stockholm	June 6–
International Conference on Textiles	Buxton, England	June 7–12
International Telephone Consultative Committee: Rates and Traffic and Technical Meetings	Stockholm	June 7–22
ILO (International Labor Organization):		
105th and 106th Sessions of Governing Body	San Francisco	June 9–
31st General Session of Conference	San Francisco	June 17–
Third International Conference on Large Dams	Stockholm	June 10–
Specialist Conference on Tropical and Sub-tropical Soils	Hertfordshire, England	June 14–28
WHO (World Health Organization):		
Sixth Session of Interim Commission	Geneva	June 18–
First General Assembly	Geneva	June 24–
Second International Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering Conference	Rotterdam	June 21–30
Eleventh International Conference on Public Education	Geneva	June 24–

U.S. Proposes Conference on Questions Regarding Danube River ¹

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH THE U.K., FRENCH, AND SOVIET GOVERNMENTS

The United States has proposed in similar notes delivered on May 25 ² to the British, French, and Soviet Embassies in Washington that a conference be convened July 30 in Belgrade for bringing about agreement on a new convention regarding the regime of navigation of the Danube. This proposal is pursuant to a Four Power declaration at the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in December 1946.

The Danube River normally is the major artery of trade between eastern and western Europe. Absence of agreement on a new convention facilitating effective intercourse in this important sphere leaves it an unsettled area in international relations where constructive cooperation is sorely needed.

The Balkan treaties of peace, which became effective September 15, 1947, contained commitments to the principle of freedom of navigation for the Danube. These treaties were signed by the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian S.S.R., the United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and others. Identical articles (article 34 in the Bulgarian, article 38 in the Hungarian, and article 36 in the Rumanian treaty) state:

"Navigation on the Danube shall be free and open for the nationals, vessels of commerce, and goods of all States, on a footing of equality in regard to port and navigation charges and conditions for merchant shipping. The foregoing shall not apply to traffic between ports of the same State."

As a corollary to the agreement on this article, the United States, United Kingdom, France, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agreed in the November-December 1946 session of the Council of Foreign Ministers in New York that a conference to work out a new convention regarding the regime of navigation of the Danube be called within six months of the coming into force of the Balkan treaties—i.e., a call should be issued by March 15, 1948. This agreement was issued as a Four Power declaration December 12, 1946.

It provided that participants should be the Four Powers, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, the Ukrainian S.S.R., and Yugoslavia. It further provided that Austria, too, "shall take

part in the conference after the question of a treaty with Austria has been settled".

In notes to the three European powers, the United States, on February 27, 1948, initiated discussions to obtain agreement among the Four Powers regarding a time for calling the conference. The notes expressed United States concern for a meeting at the "earliest practicable time."

The United States has urged full participation for Austria. This position has been based on the importance of Austrian interests as a major riparian nation and the part Austria can play in development of more abundant commerce beneficial to all Danubian interests. The United States also had in mind its frequently stated position that Austria should enjoy the status of a liberated nation. On these considerations, and because treaty discussions then getting under way in London might settle the treaty question without much delay, the United States in its initial note of February 27 suggested that the time for issuing a conference call be extended beyond March 15 to some time later in 1948.

The United Kingdom and France agreed; the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recognized the "grave importance" of settlement of questions about Danube navigation but rejected Austria's unresolved status as a factor in determining a time for the conference. Thus, there was agreement with the United States desire for a meeting at the earliest practicable time, but there were differences of opinion as to what that time would be.

The United States responded April 12, again urging the importance of Austrian participation, reiterating its desire for an early conference, and suggesting that work of the conference could be facilitated and speeded if the Four Powers would exchange views in Washington beforehand.

The Soviet Government replied on May 8, terming the idea of preliminary discussions in Washington unacceptable, again rejecting Austrian participation, stating its understanding that Yugoslavia would "make it possible for a Danube conference to be held in the city of Belgrade", and suggesting May 30 as a date.

The United States notes of May 25 point out that arrangements could not possibly be concluded for

¹ Released to the press May 26, 1948.

² Not printed.

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

May 30, propose the practicable date of July 30, and again urge Austrian participation—in at least a consultative capacity, as it now participates in deliberations of other international bodies, such as the Economic Commission for Europe.

Without seeking any special rights, commercial or other, for itself, the United States has evidenced active interest in the freedom of Danube navigation ever since the end of the recent war in pursuance of its permanent interest in opening the way to fuller international trade and facilitating commerce. It has consistently pursued the inter-

est in the deliberations of the Allied Council for Austria, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and the Council of Foreign Ministers. The needs of the peoples of both eastern and western Europe require that international agreement be reached on constructive means to facilitate free and open navigation on this vital European waterway. The welfare of all these peoples would be enhanced—and their living standards improved—by freer international commerce, upon which European and world reconstruction so largely depends.

DECISIONS AT THE COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS MEETINGS IN DECEMBER 1946

1. Danube provisions in the Balkan peace treaties (identical articles 34 in the Bulgarian, 38 in the Hungarian and 36 in the Rumanian treaty, signed February 10, 1947):

"Navigation on the Danube shall be free and open for the nationals, vessels of commerce, and goods of all States, on a footing of equality in regard to port and navigation charges and conditions for merchant shipping. The foregoing shall not apply to traffic between ports of the same State."

2. Four Power Declaration, adopted December 6, 1946, regarding the calling of a Danube conference:

"1. The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R., and France agree

to call within six months of the coming into force of the Peace Treaties with Roumania, Bulgaria and Hungary, a Conference to work out a new convention regarding the regime of navigation on the Danube to be composed of representatives of the Danubian States: the U.S.S.R., the Ukrainian S.S.R., Bulgaria, Roumania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, and representatives of the following States, members of the Council of Foreign Ministers: the United States, the United Kingdom, and France.

"2. Subsequent changes in this convention, should they become necessary, shall also be made by the Conference composed as indicated above.

"3. Austria shall take part in the above-mentioned conferences after the question of a Treaty with Austria has been settled."

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY MARSHALL

Following a preliminary exchange of views initiated by this Government, the United States yesterday proposed to the British, French, and Soviet Governments that a conference be called for July 30 on certain questions regarding the Danube River.

This vital European waterway normally affords the nations of eastern and western Europe their principal means of carrying on commerce. Its free

and open navigation, with resultant benefits of more abundant trade, is of very real urgency to the peoples of all Europe in their daily lives. It is our conviction that a beneficial new convention for the regime of navigation on the Danube should be worked out as soon as possible.

Until we reach agreement on a new convention, this important sphere remains an unsettled area in international relations. It should be, instead, an area of constructive cooperation.

INTERNATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATED BY INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

[Released to the press May 29]

A network of main international highways for truck transport was tentatively designated by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe meeting in Geneva in April for the western European countries of Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, and Bizonal Germany.

Routes selected for the international system include much of Germany's *Autobahn* and Italy's *Autostrada*, together with some of the better national highways of the other countries and with projected roads yet to be constructed.

Although roads in other countries not represented at Geneva were designated, no action is to be taken to incorporate them into the international system until agreements are reached with such countries.

The designated network will assist tourist travel as well as freight traffic since special efforts will be made to expedite customs formalities at the frontier crossing points.

Agreement on this road network is considered further evidence of cooperation among western European governments and reflects a desire to develop and promote highway transport. Previously these same governments had agreed to freedom of movement of truck transport. The designated international highway system is to be developed to assure uniform design standards and markings in each of the participating countries.

U.S. DELEGATION TO SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOIL MECHANICS AND FOUNDATION ENGINEERING

[Released to the press May 28]

The Department of State has announced the composition of the United States Delegation to the Second International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, scheduled to be held at Rotterdam, June 21-30, 1948. The United States Delegation is as follows:

Chairman

T. A. Middlebrooks, Chief, Soils Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army

Vice Chairman

Dr. Karl Terzaghi, Consulting Engineer, Graduate School, Harvard University

Members of the Delegation

T. B. Chambers, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture
Edwin A. Daday, Comdr., Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, Staff of Commander of Naval Forces East Atlantic and Mediterranean, London

June 6, 1948

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

Gall A. Hathaway, Special Assistant to Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army
B. F. Jakobsen, Chief, Plans and Specifications Section, South Pacific Division, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army

Charles J. Merdinger, Lt. Comdr., Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, Oxford, England

Clarence Rawhouser, Engineer, Dams Division, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior

James B. Thompson, Assistant to Head of Soil Mechanics and Paving Section, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy

Carl P. Vetter, Chief, Office of River Control of the Colorado River, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior

Walker R. Young, Chief Engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior

The Conference will discuss the utilization of soil as a building material in dams and other structures and compare findings of experiments and exchange information on experiences in soil mechanics since the First Conference, which was held at Harvard University, Cambridge, June 22-27, 1936.

The agenda of the meeting includes the following topics: (1) theories, hypotheses, and considerations of common nature; (2) tests in the laboratory; (3) investigations in the field; (4) stability and deformation of artificial fills; (5) slides in natural ground; (6) earth pressure on artificial supports; (7) settlement of buildings on footings and mats; (8) pile foundations; (9) problems in road and railway construction; (10) improvement of the mechanical properties of the soil; (11) ground-water observations and drainage; (12) survey of the work of laboratories and individuals in the field of soil mechanics; and (13) suggestions for exchange of information.

To stimulate interest in and to encourage the preparation of papers for the Second International Conference, national committees were organized in a number of countries. The United States National Committee on Soil Mechanics was created in February 1947. Philip C. Rutledge of Northwestern University is the chairman of the Committee.

U.S. DELEGATION TO THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON LARGE DAMS

[Released to the press May 26]

The Department of State announced on May 26 the composition of the United States Delegation to the Third International Congress on Large Dams, scheduled to be held at Stockholm, June 10-17, 1948. The United States Delegation is as follows:

Chairman

Gall A. Hathaway, Special Assistant to Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army

Vice Chairmen

Joel D. Justin, Consulting Engineer, Cornell University

(Continued on page 751)

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

Soviet Violations of Treaty Obligations: Document Submitted by the Department of State to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations¹

I. GERMANY

Agreements

1. The final delimitation of German-Polish frontier should await the peace settlement (Potsdam protocol, VIII, B).

2. Payment of reparations to leave enough resources to enable German people to subsist without external assistance. Reparation claims of U.S.S.R. to be met by removals of capital goods and appropriation of external assets. Economic controls in Germany to be limited to those essential to curb German war potential and insure equitable distribution of essential goods among zones (Potsdam protocol, II, B, 15, 19; III, 1).

3. Economic Directorate of Aca agreed, May 24, 1946, that each member would submit report on reparations removals from its zone.

4. Germany to be treated as a single economic unit (Potsdam protocol, II, B, 14).

5. All democratic political parties to be allowed and encouraged throughout Germany (Potsdam protocol, II, A, 9).

6. Control Council agreed to prevent German political leaders or press from making statements criticizing allied decisions or aimed at disrupting allied unity or creating hostile German attitude toward any of occupying powers (Control Council Directive No. 40).

7. The Allied Control Authority has authorized the free exchange of printed matter and films in the different zones and Berlin (Control Council Directive No. 55).

8. Freedom of speech and press are guaranteed (Potsdam protocol, II, A, 10). Germany is to be prepared for eventual reconstruction of political life on democratic basis (Potsdam protocol, II, A, 3).

9. German external assets in Finland, eastern Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, to be vested in the German External Property Commission (Control Council Law No. 5).

10. Quadripartite legislation has been enacted to provide for tax uniformity and stabilization of wages in all zones (Control Council Laws Nos. 12 and 61; Control Council Directive No. 14).

Violations

1. U.S.S.R. has repeatedly maintained that the Oder-Neisse line constitutes the definitive German-

Polish frontier and has approved incorporation of territory east of this line into Poland.

2. U.S.S.R. has taken large amounts of reparations from current production, has absorbed a substantial part of German industry in Soviet zone into Soviet state-owned concerns, and has otherwise exploited and drained German resources in a manner not authorized by Potsdam protocol or other agreements.

3. U.S.S.R. has refused to submit report on any reparations removals from its zone.

4. U.S.S.R. has consistently obstructed all four-power attempts to implement this principle and has carried out a unilateral economic policy in its own zone. In particular it has refused to cooperate in establishing a common export-import program for Germany as a whole, and in permitting "equitable distribution of essential commodities between zones so as to produce a balanced economy throughout Germany and reduce the need for imports."

5. Soviet authorities have restricted the freedom of action of non-Communist parties by depriving them of equal facilities with the SED, interfering in their internal affairs, coercing their leaders, dictating party actions, and in general denying them the autonomy essential to democratic political organizations. They have denied the Social Democratic Party the right to operate in the Soviet zone as an independent organization.

6. Soviet authorities have permitted and encouraged scurrilous propagandistic campaign by the Soviet zone press and political leaders directed against the western powers, and particularly the United States.

7. Soviet authorities have repeatedly barred such materials originating in other zones from the Soviet zone or Soviet sector of Berlin.

8. Soviet authorities have instituted a system of suppression, intimidation and terrorism through military, police, and party authorities that nullifies any genuine freedom of speech and press. A totalitarian system of police control is being built up which suppresses basic human rights and legal processes and indulges in arbitrary seizures of property, arrests, deportation, forced labor and other practices which are incompatible with democratic principles.

9. U.S.S.R. has directly appropriated German external assets in these countries without unvesting and assignment by the German External Property

¹ Reproduced from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee print of the report on S. Res. 213.

Commission as required by Control Council Law No. 5.

10. Soviet authorities have permitted the land governments of Brandenburg and Saxony-Anhalt to grant partial tax exemptions to large groups of wage and salary earners in violation of this legislation. This move is intended to stop the exodus of skilled workers to the western zones, encourage qualified workers to take jobs in Soviet-owned factories, and make propaganda for the improving living standards of Soviet-zone workers.

II. AUSTRIA

Agreements

1. The Allied Council would insure the removal of all restrictions on movement within Austria of persons, goods, or other traffic; economic unity to be promoted (new control agreement of June 28, 1946, art. 4,a).

2. Obligation to open the way for the Austrian people to find economic security (Moscow declaration). Obligation of Allied Council (i.e. occupying powers) to assist Austrian Government to recreate a sound national life based on stable economic and financial conditions (new control agreement, art. 3,c).

3. Obligation to assist Austrian Government to recreate a sound national life based on stable economic and financial conditions; to assist Austrian Government to assume full control of affairs of state in Austria; to facilitate full exercise of Austrian Government's authority equally in all zones; to promote the economic unity of Austria (new control agreement, arts. 3,c; 3,d; and 4,a).

4. Obligations with respect to stable economic and financial conditions, free movement within Austria as a whole, and economic unity (new control agreement, arts. 3,c; 4,a).

5. Obligation to assist Austrian Government to recreate a sound and democratic national life based on respect for law and order (new control agreement, art. 3,c).

6. Obligations with respect to law and order, assumption by Austrian Government of full control of affairs of state, full exercise of Austrian Government's authority equally in all zones (new control agreement, arts. 3,c; 3,d; and 4,a).

7. Obligation with respect to full exercise of Austrian Government's authority equally in all zones (new control agreement, art. 4,a).

Violations

1. Soviet-instituted system of licensing specified categories of goods for shipment from eastern to other zones (December 1947) impedes free movement of goods and traffic throughout Austria as a whole.

2. Properties seized by Soviets as oil in 1945,

land in February 1946, industrial plants in April 1946, and later exceed what might reasonably be construed as legitimate German assets under the Potsdam protocol. Removals of equipment and materials under guise of "German assets" and "war booty".

3. Withholding of certain food and industrial production from Austrian economy and from application of Austrian law.

4. Soviets designate certain railroad cars as "war booty", prohibit their movement from Soviet to other zones, and propose Austrians "repurchase" these cars (April 1948).

5. Soviet interference with Austrian efforts to maintain law and order through arbitrary arrest or abduction of Austrians (i.e., abduction of transport official from a train in December 1947).

6. Confiscation in eastern zone and Soviet sector of Vienna of certain issues of the United States-sponsored *Wiener Kurier* and other publications; threats to distributors of such publications.

7. Local Soviet military authorities insist that 17 nonelected Communist mayors remain in office in Soviet zone against authority of provincial and national governments.

III. EASTERN AND SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

Poland

Agreements

"This Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates" (Crimean Conference, February 12, 1945).

"The three powers note that the Polish Provisional Government in accordance with the decisions of the Crimea Conference has agreed to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot in which all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates . . ." (Potsdam agreement, August 2, 1945)

Violation

On several occasions prior to the elections and following persistent reports of reprehensible methods employed by the Government against the democratic opposition, this Government reminded the Polish Provisional Government of its obligations under the Yalta and Potsdam agreements and was joined on these occasions by the British Government. On January 5, 1947, the British and Soviet Governments were asked to associate themselves with this Government in approaching the Poles on this subject, and the British Government made

similar representations to the Soviet Government reiterating the request that the Soviet Government support the British and American Governments in calling for a strict fulfillment of Poland's obligations. The Soviet Government refused to participate in the proposed approach to the Polish Government. The British and American representations were summarily rejected by the Polish Government as "undue interference" in the internal affairs of Poland.

Of the 444 deputies elected to the parliament in the elections of January 19, 1947, the Polish Peasant Party (reliably reported to represent a large majority of the population) obtained only 28 places, thus demonstrating the efficiency with which the government had prepared the ground. On January 28, the Department of State issued a release to the press stating that reports received from our Embassy in Poland immediately prior to and subsequent to the elections, based upon the observations of American officials, confirmed the fears which this Government had expressed that the election would not be free.

Hungary *Agreement*

1. Under the armistice agreement an Allied Control Commission was established under the chairmanship of the U.S.S.R. and with participation of the United States and United Kingdom (armistice agreement, January 1945, art. 18 and annex F).

2. The three heads of the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, and United Kingdom declared their mutual agreement to concert during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe the policies of their three Governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems (Yalta agreement, February 1945).

3. Upon the cessation of hostilities, it was agreed at Potsdam that the United States, United Kingdom and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would consult with a view to revising the procedures of the Allied Control Commissions for Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary to provide for effective participation by the United States and United Kingdom in the work of those bodies (Potsdam protocol XI, August 1945).

Violation

1. The U.S.S.R. representative on the Acc for Hungary consistently acted unilaterally in the name of the Acc without consultation with or notice to his United States and United Kingdom colleagues, thus denying them any semblance of effective participation in the work of the Acc.

2. Contrary to the Yalta agreement, the U.S.S.R., acting through the Hungarian Communist Party and its own agencies and armed forces in Hungary, far from concerting its policy toward assisting the Hungarian people to solve their problems by democratic means, unilaterally subverted the will of the Hungarian people to totalitarianism in negation of fundamental freedoms. For example—

(1) General Sviridov, Deputy Soviet Chairman of the Acc, without consulting the United States and United Kingdom Acc representatives, dissolved Catholic youth organizations, June 1946.

(2) Soviet armed forces arrested Bela Kovacs, member of Parliament and former secretary general of Smallholders Party, February 1947.

(3) General Sviridov precipitated a political crisis enabling the Communist minority to force the resignation of Prime Minister Nagy, May-June 1947.

(4) The Soviet Government refused repeated United States proposals that it join in tripartite examination of Hungary's economic situation with a view to assisting Hungary to solve its pressing economic problems, 1946.

(5) Discriminatory economic agreements were forced upon Hungary, including the establishment of joint Soviet-Hungarian companies, 1945-47.

(6) The Soviet Acc contended that only the occupational forces who control the airfields can permit the Hungarian Government to negotiate air agreements. Notwithstanding, the Soviets formed a Hungarian-Soviet civil air transport company. The Soviets also permitted the Hungarian Government to negotiate agreements with certain other countries but not with the United States or Britain.

3. Despite repeated requests, the U.S.S.R. declined to discuss the revision of procedures for the Acc's as agreed at Potsdam. Instead, the U.S.S.R. continued to act unilaterally in the name of the Acc's in matters of substance without consultation with, or notice to, the United States and United Kingdom members. For example—

(1) Instructions were issued by the Soviet High Command regarding the size of the Hungarian Army without consulting the British or United States representatives.

(2) The Soviet deputy chairman of the Acc ordered the Hungarian Government without the knowledge of the United States to disband certain Catholic youth organizations in June-July 1946. He also recommended dismissal of certain Government officials.

(3) In the fall of 1946 permission was given by the Soviet element of the Allied Control Commission, without consulting the Americans or British, for the formation of the Hungarian Freedom Party.

(4) Early in 1947 the Hungarian police were ordered by the Soviet chairman in the name of the Allied Control Commission to suppress the publication of Ciano's diary.

(5) In early 1947 the Soviet chairman stated he had personally given approval to the Hungarian Government to resume diplomatic relations with certain countries in the name of the Allied Control Commission and without prior discussion with the British or Americans.

(6) In May 1947 the Acc chairman refused the United States permission to visit Hungarian Army units.

(7) The Soviets refused to permit free movement of the American element of the Allied Control Commission.

(8) The Soviets refused to transmit to the American representative data on the arrest by the Soviet Army of Bela Kovacs.

Bulgaria

Agreement

1. By the terms of the armistice agreement an Allied Control Commission under Soviet direction during the period of hostilities but with the United States and United Kingdom participation was established (armistice agreement, October 1944, art. XVIII).

2. Bulgaria was obligated to restore United Nations property, to make reparation for war damage as later determined, to restore all United Nations rights and interests, and to make available to Greece and Yugoslavia immediately on reparation account foodstuffs in quantities to be agreed by the United States, United Kingdom, and Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (armistice agreement, October 1944, arts. IX, X, XI, and par. 1 of protocol).

3. The three heads of the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, and United Kingdom declared their mutual agreement to concert during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe the policies of their three Governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems.

4. The United Kingdom, United States, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated they had no doubt that representatives of the allied press would enjoy full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Bulgaria (Potsdam communique X, August 1945).

5. Upon the termination of hostilities, agreement was reached at Potsdam that consultations should be held with a view to revising the procedures of the Allied Control Commissions for Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary to provide for

effective three-power participation in the Commissions (Potsdam protocol XI, August 1945).

6. The U.S.S.R. undertook to give friendly advice to the Bulgarian Government regarding the desirability of the inclusion in the government of two representatives of democratic groups, "who (a) are truly representative of the groups of the parties which are not participating in the Government, and (b) are really suitable and will work loyally with the Government" (Moscow Conference, December 1945).

Violation

1. The Soviet chairman of the Acc repeatedly took unilateral action in the name of the Acc and without consultation with his United States or United Kingdom colleagues, thus effectively negating the United States and United Kingdom participation in that body.

2. The U.S.S.R. has aided and abetted the Bulgarian Government in failing to fulfill these provisions of the armistice to varying degrees. The Soviets have refused to consider with the United States and United Kingdom Bulgaria's obligation to restore and restitute United Nations property and interests and, while deliveries of foodstuffs were made to the Yugoslavs unilaterally, the U.S.S.R. has blocked three-power consideration of amounts to be shipped to Greece. None has been shipped to that country.

3. The Soviet Government has consistently refused to concert policies with the United States and United Kingdom to assist the people of Bulgaria to solve their political and economic problems democratically. On the contrary the Soviet Government, through the local Communist Party, has unilaterally subverted representative democratic processes in Bulgaria and assisted in denying the Bulgarian people the exercise of fundamental freedoms. For example, in 1945 the Soviets unilaterally interfered in the internal affairs of Bulgaria's largest political party by demanding and obtaining the replacement of Dr. G. M. Dimitrov as Secretary General of the Agrarian Union.

4. The Soviet Chairman of the Acc consistently thwarted American press coverage of Bulgarian developments by negative or extremely dilatory action on United States Government requests for entry permits for reputable American correspondents. Conversely, representatives of the *Daily Worker* and other left-wing periodicals were permitted to enter Bulgaria without difficulties.

5. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics refused repeated United States and United Kingdom requests to consult as agreed, and continued to operate the Acc's unilaterally without effective participation of or even, on occasion, knowledge

of the United States and United Kingdom members.

6. The Soviet authorities, despite the Moscow agreement, aided and abetted a minority Bulgarian Communist regime in thwarting the implementation of that agreement and prevented the broadening of the Bulgarian Government envisaged therein.

Rumania *Agreement*

1. The three heads of the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, and United Kingdom declared their mutual agreement to concert during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe the policies of their three Governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems (Yalta agreement on liberated Europe, February 1945).

2. Upon the cessation of hostilities, it was agreed at Potsdam that the allied control Commission procedure should be revised to provide for effective United States and United Kingdom participation in the work of those bodies (Potsdam protocol XI, revised Allied Control Commission procedure in Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary).

3. The three Governments stated that they had no doubt that, in view of the changed conditions resulting from the termination of the war in Europe, representatives of the allied press would enjoy full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Rumania.

Violation

1. Contrary to its agreement at Yalta, the U.S.S.R., acting through the Rumanian Communist Party and its own agencies and armed forces in Rumania, systematically and unilaterally subverted the democratic will of the Rumanian people to totalitarianism in negation of their fundamental freedoms. Major examples of such U.S.S.R. actions may be cited as follows:

(1) Unilateral intervention by Soviet occupation authorities and by Vishinsky (February-March 1945) in effecting the overthrow of Premier Radescu's interim representative government and the installation of a Communist-controlled regime. Refusal in this connection to concert either with the United States representatives in Rumania or on a governmental level.

(2) Unilateral support of Premier Groza's retention of office in defiance of the King's demand for his resignation and the United States request for tripartite consultation in response to the King's appeal (August 1945).

(3) Direct and indirect unilateral interference by the Soviet occupation authorities in the election campaign of 1946, extending to the use of Soviet troops to break up meetings of the opposition and the arbitrary exercise of censorship.

(4) Preclusive exploitation of the Rumanian economy, from 1944 onward, through (a) armistice extractions many times in excess of the requirements of the armistice agreement and in large measure unauthorized by that agreement, (b) through the establishment of Soviet-controlled joint companies covering the principal economic activities of Rumania, and (c) through commercial agreements the knowledge of whose terms was repeatedly refused to the other two Yalta powers.

(5) Rejection of a proposal by the United States and United Kingdom in December 1946 for setting up a joint commission to study the economic situation in Rumania.

(6) Unilateral intervention, from March 1945 onward, in Rumanian commercial negotiations with countries outside the Soviet orbit.

2. Despite repeated requests, the U.S.S.R. refused to consult with a view to accomplishing the procedural revision agreed to at Potsdam and continued unilaterally to operate the Acc in Rumania without effective participation by the United States and United Kingdom. Examples of such actions may be cited as follows:

(1) Issuance of directives to Rumanian authorities by Soviet element of Acc, throughout armistice period, without agreement of United States and United Kingdom representatives, sometimes in the face of United States and United Kingdom protests, often without even notification or discussion. Many of these directives were prejudicial to United States interests.

(2) Obstructive handling, throughout armistice period, of clearances to enter Rumania for official United States personnel and aircraft.

3. In contravention of this agreement, the Soviet chairman of the Control Commission, by the usurpation of authority, delayed and withheld entry permits to Rumania for accredited United States correspondents, ejected several correspondents from that country on fabricated charges, and censored United States press dispatches. These obstructive tactics, which continued throughout the armistice period, were particularly in evidence prior to the Rumanian elections of November 1946.

IV. KOREA

Agreements

1. Reestablishment of movement of persons, motor, rail transport and coastwise shipping between the zones of north and south Korea (agreement of Joint United States and Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics Conference, January-February 1946).

2. Consultation by the Joint United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Commission with "Korean democratic parties and social organizations" in the preparation of proposals for the formation of a provisional Korean government (Moscow agreement, December 27, 1945, III, 2).

3. That the Joint United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Commission would consult with political groups "truly democratic in their aims and methods", who would declare their willingness to "uphold the aims of the Moscow Decision," "abide by the decisions of the Joint Commission in . . . the formation of a provisional Korean government . . ." (Joint Commission communique No. 5, April 18, 1946).

4. That a signature of the communiqué No. 5 (later included in decision No. 12) will be accepted as a declaration of good faith with respect to upholding fully the Moscow agreement and will make the signatory party or organization eligible for consultation by the Joint Commission; that such signatories who, after signing the communiqué, foment or instigate active opposition to the Joint Commission, the two powers, or the Moscow agreement, can be declared ineligible for consultation only by mutual agreement of the two delegations on the Joint Commission (exchange of letters between Secretary Marshall and Foreign Minister Molotov, May 2 through May 12, 1947, citing the November 26, 1946, December 24, 1946, exchange of letters between the Soviet and American commanders).

Violations

1. The Soviet command in north Korea has since 1946 refused to discuss or implement the agreements reached on these matters, resisting efforts toward reestablishing the natural economic unity of the country. Concessions to economic coordination have been made only on a barter basis. No regularized movement of persons or transport has been established beyond that allowing the limited supply by the United States of its outposts that are accessible only by roads through Soviet-occupied territory.

2. The U.S.S.R. delegation on the Joint Commission consistently refused to allow such consultation except under unilateral interpretations of the phrase, "democratic parties and social organizations," which interpretation, in each case, would exclude all but pro-Soviet political groups.

3. The U.S.S.R. delegation refused to consult with groups adhering to communique No. 5 if the representatives of the group had ever expressed opposition to the provision for placing Korea under the period of trusteeship envisaged in the Moscow agreement.

4. The U.S.S.R. delegation refused to adhere to the agreement when an attempt was made to schedule the party consultations. The U.S.S.R. delegation unilaterally asserted that, despite the signature of communiqué No. 5, and despite assurances of cooperation with the Commission, and a pledge to refrain from fomenting or instigating active opposition, the members of a so-called anti-trusteeship committee could not be consulted by the Joint Commission.

V. MANCHURIA

Agreements

1. "The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance in the postwar period with a view to facilitating and accelerating reconstruction in both countries and to contributing to the cause of world prosperity" (Sino-Soviet treaty and agreements of August 14, 1945, art. VI).

2. ". . . In accordance with the spirit of the aforementioned treaty, and in order to put into effect its aims and purposes, the Government of the U.S.S.R. agrees to render to China moral support and aid in military supplies and other material resources, such support and aid to be entirely given to the National Government as the central government of China.

"2. In the course of conversations . . . the Government of the U.S.S.R. regarded the three eastern provinces (i.e. Manchuria) as part of China" (note of V. M. Molotov, August 14, 1945, relating to the treaty of friendship and alliance).

3. "The administration of Dairen shall belong to China" (agreement concerning Dairen of August 14, 1945).

Violations

1. "Industry . . . (in the three eastern provinces, also known as Manchuria) . . . was directly damaged to the extent of \$858,000,000 during Soviet occupancy . . . the greatest part of the damage to the Manchurian industrial complex . . . was primarily due to Soviet removals of equipment" (Department of State press release No. 907 of December 13, 1947, citing Pauley report).

2. The Chinese Government has failed to receive from the U.S.S.R. since August 14, 1945, the promised military supplies and other material resources. But when Russian troops withdrew from Manchuria. "Chinese Communists in that area appeared with Japanese arms in very substantial quantities . . . the natural assumption is that they were taken with the acquiescence, at least, of the Russians." (Quotation is from testimony of W. W. Butterworth at hearing before the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, December 17, 1947.)

3. Chinese Government troops attempting to en-

ter Manchuria subsequent to the Japanese surrender were denied the right to land at Dairen by the Soviet authorities there and were forced to utilize less advantageous landing points.

Due in large part to Soviet obstructionism, China has up to the present time been unable to establish a Chinese Government administration at Dairen.

Firm and Determined Course for the Democracies

BY GEORGE C. MARSHALL¹

Secretary of State

It is unnecessary I think for me to re-outline what has taken place recently between the United States and the Soviet Union in particular and the western European countries and the Soviet and satellite countries in general. However, there are certain aspects of the situation which it might be profitable to discuss. For example, in our intense desire for peace, in our longing for some firm basis of accord between or among the principal nations of the world, we are apt to be confused as to the actual facts and conditions involved in achieving our desires. The method of modern totalitarian propaganda is to twist, pervert, and confuse and to create an impression which may not in any way represent the true situation or the possibilities for successful action. As I have explained in public statements we have reached a virtual stalemate in a number of courts of action. The Conference of Foreign Ministers has struggled unsuccessfully for months and days on end to find a basis of agreement for a settlement regarding Austria. We have had similar experiences with relation to a peace settlement for Germany, making virtually no progress whatever. As a matter of fact, in London last December it required 10 days to reach agreement merely on the agenda for the meeting, and the meeting itself was seized upon largely by the Soviet authorities as an opportunity for propaganda statements for wide distribution, particularly in Germany and the satellite states. You are probably more familiar with the efforts of the Security Council of the United Nations with regard to the problem of atomic energy and a number of other matters pertaining to the regulation of the peace of the world. The Assembly of the United Nations, not afflicted by the veto power, has been able to dispatch groups of its members to observe conditions in Greece and Korea, but these groups have been seriously limited or handicapped by the refusal of the Soviet Union and other governments of eastern Europe to participate, or even to permit the free movement and action of these representatives of the United Nations Assembly on territories under their control. Endless discussions or negotiations have failed to secure the coop-

eration which is imperative to the stabilization of the world situation and the development of a sound basis for continuing peace.

There is an overwhelming demand for some agreement to wipe out fear of war and to bring about a return to normal conditions, and therefore strong resentment of any statement or lack of action that appears contrary to the fulfillment of that desire. These great desires are impelled by deep emotions but those emotions must not lead us into ill-advised and trustful actions which hazard the future of this country. I am sure that no one's desire is greater than mine to find a basis for peaceful security and a return of general prosperity to the world. But it is my official duty to see that this country is not misled by its emotions into commitments or actions which would threaten our future.

As a matter of fact, I think excellent progress has been made since the first of the year. It has been history-making and will later on be so recognized. I feel certain that the continuation of the firm course we have been following will lead to the solution of the worst of our difficulties and will eventually clear the way to a sound basis for peace. I am absolutely certain that only such a firm and determined course can save the situation for the democracies.

In this connection, it is of the utmost importance that all Americans realize the significance of our position in the world today. Our leadership is recognized the world over, but the obligations of such leadership are not completely recognized by us Americans ourselves. We are generous, sometimes to a fault, but it is just as important that we be understanding. By this I mean that we must try our best to realize the situation of other peoples and their point of view and their inevitable reactions to many things that are publicly proclaimed in this country. We often defeat our own generosity or aims by ignoring the sensitivity of people to their national pride, and the utterly different surroundings in which they live compared to ours here in America. This applies not only to the nations of western Europe; it applies also to those behind the Iron Curtain. There, however, the people are fed on the diet of a controlled press and an astonishing propaganda, astonishing because of its utter

¹ Excerpts from an address made before the General Federation of Women's Clubs in Portland, Oreg. on May 28, 1948, and released to the press on the same date.

indifference to the facts. For this reason it is not easy, even with the best of will, to get across to them the real facts concerning our attitude.

One particularly important aspect of our position of acknowledged leadership is the constant fear of the people of Europe that we cannot be depended upon, that we will change our minds, that we will turn from a formally adopted policy like the European Recovery Program without notice and without regard to the devastating effect of such vacillation. This fear is based somewhat on a faulty understanding of the way in which policy is really developed in a democracy such as ours. But we, on the other hand, must be careful not to encourage it by thoughtless or spasmodic action. It is essential that we debate as we do the "pros" and "cons" of each proposed line of action. But once we have decided upon it, it is even more important that we do not quickly weaken or appear to weaken in our support of that policy and shift to some other point of view. The present destructive proposal for the amendment or emasculatation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is a case in point.

We are an impatient people. We demand quick action. That has accounted for much of our success in developing this country. But much more of patience and persistence is required in dealing with great international situations.

There is another factor of the present situation which I wish to mention. It is very important to realize that the world today is in a ferment of profound unrest. The great mass of the ill-favored people of the world have come to realize all that they lack in comparison with the advantages enjoyed by others. The tremendous development of communications and of the motion picture has brought to these masses at least a partial understanding of the unfairness of their situation. In any comparison we stand on a pinnacle. Nowhere in the world have the mass of the people enjoyed such a high standard of living and such opportunities as in this country.

In the development of this world movement I have referred to, our situation can win us friends or make us enemies. We must not ignore these two possibilities. But it is even more important to have in mind that there is this great surge of feeling under way, which is a ground swell now, but may become a tidal wave later, unless it is met by some definite hope of improvement through the action of the governments concerned and through the rehabilitation of the economy of the world, which is the purpose of our present programs. Meanwhile, this unrest presents a fertile field for those who advocate violence as a corrective measure or action for ulterior purposes.

In dealing with the international situation, particularly with reference to the Soviet Union and its satellite states, the democracies suffer from a

certain tactical vulnerability arising from the complete freedom of expression and the generosity of debate within their countries, in contrast to the procedure on the other side of the fence where a carefully agreed upon line of action is set in motion, with no possibility of criticism because a strong hand compels complete support. Such a method enjoys great advantages for the moment. In the end, I think it will defeat itself, if history is a true indication of probabilities. But in the short-term issues, like those of the present period, it does present great difficulties for us.

For example, we have today a heated public discussion as to what is the proper procedure for this Government in its relations with the Soviet Union, a discussion which largely ignores the fact that we are faced with a deliberate, a cynical propaganda campaign to offset a sincere effort on our part to establish a basis for profitable negotiations and agreements leading to a stabilization of the world situation.

Now that is a very general statement. I will particularize. A diplomatic interchange took place as you all know between our Ambassador in Moscow and the Soviet Foreign Minister.² Contrary to diplomatic precedent, the one Government chose to release without notice to the other a portion of the discussion. All of its own statements were released to the press but only a portion of the statements of our Ambassador. However, the procedure went much further than that. In the last and the most important paragraph—one of only four sentences, two of the sentences were omitted, completely distorting the meaning so as to form the basis for the Soviet propaganda purpose.

In Ambassador Smith's statement, the closing paragraph contained the following sentences:

"My Government earnestly hopes that the members of the Soviet Government will not take lightly the position of the United States Government, as here expressed. They have it in their power to alleviate many of the situations which today weigh so heavily on all international life. It is our earnest hope that they will take advantage of these possibilities. If they do, they will not find us lacking in readiness and eagerness to make our own contribution to a stabilization of world conditions entirely compatible with the security of the Soviet peoples."

This statement clearly meant that if the Soviet Government would abandon certain courses of conduct and action which have kept the world in a state of uneasiness and confusion since the close of hostilities, they would thereby produce an entirely new international atmosphere—and that if they did, then they would not find any lack of response from this Government.

² BULLETIN of May 23, 1948, p. 679.

In the version published by the Soviet Government, the second and third sentences I have just read above were omitted, and in the radio broadcast from Moscow the first three words of the last sentence were also omitted.

By this means it was possible momentarily to create the impression that the United States had proposed direct or unilateral negotiation, when the full text was not susceptible of any such interpretation.

What does that mean to you? It meant to me that the officials of the Soviet Government knew we would recognize that the purpose of their release was to gain a propaganda advantage in order

to mislead the American public, in fact the world public, as to the sincerity of their desire to reach an understanding.

In dealing with these difficulties in the situation I feel, and I think all will agree, that it is very important to maintain the reputation for the integrity of action of this Government. We cannot afford to pursue any line of action, however successful it might be for the time being, which would reflect on the integrity of our purpose or actions in the future. We cannot stoop to a propaganda procedure which takes little account of facts and less of the proprieties.

U.S. Answers Soviet Protest Regarding Activities of American Aircraft Near Japan

[Released to the press May 27]

On May 25 the American Embassy in Moscow replied to various Soviet notes of protest¹ concerning the activities of American aircraft over waters adjoining Japan.

The Embassy's note informed the Soviet Government that a thorough investigation had been conducted of the instances cited in the Soviet notes and that careful study had been given to the allegations of the Soviet Government that the activities of United States aircraft in these waters violated the freedom of commercial navigation. In no single one of the more than 50 cases to which objection had been made by the Soviet Government, however, was there evidence, either in the Soviet notes or from the investigation undertaken by the United States authorities, that the aircraft in question were in such an attitude or position, regardless of their altitude, that they constituted any interference with commercial navigation. The note continued that the Government of the United States desired to point out that under the Moscow Agreement the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers issues all orders for the occu-

pation and control of Japan. In carrying out this responsibility the Supreme Commander has used the Air, Army, and Naval forces at his disposal to prevent smuggling and illegal entry into Japan. Effective measures to accomplish this mission must include surface and aerial surveillance of shipping in offshore waters of the areas concerned, as well as ground action on peripheral shores. Low flying within the limits of safety in conducting this off-shore patrol is absolutely necessary for recognition purposes. These activities serve the interests of the Soviet Government as well as of other nations concerned with the occupation and control of Japan.

The note points out that the United States Government considers these activities legitimate and is unable to accept the Soviet contention that they constitute in any way a violation of the freedom of commercial shipping.

In conclusion, the note informs the Soviet Government that American pilots have been instructed to avoid the creation of any hazard in carrying out their responsibilities under orders from the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers.

Suspension of Austrian Treaty Negotiations

GENERAL STATEMENT

[Released to the press May 26]

The meetings of the Foreign Ministers' Deputies for Austria in London have been temporarily suspended while it is ascertained whether there exists a justifiable basis for continued negotiations. In view of the progress which had been made in the Austrian treaty negotiations and of the ever-narrowing area of disagreement still remaining, the Department of State hoped that the

treaty could have been concluded at this time and the Austrian people restored to their rightful status of full freedom and independence.

The Soviet Delegation, however, supported the claims of Yugoslavia to territory in Southern Carinthia and Styria and to reparations from Austria in the amount of 150 million dollars. The United States Delegation, along with the British and French Delegations, has been unable to find any justifiable basis for the recognition of these claims. The 1937 frontier between Austria and

¹ Not here printed.

Yugoslavia was fixed by plebiscite in accordance with the Treaty of St. Germain and sanctioned by international recognition since 1920. The revision of this frontier would be an unwarranted imposition on a small liberated country, inconsistent with the spirit of the Moscow Declaration, and prejudicial to the stability of this area and Austria's hope of becoming a self-supporting nation. It had always been assumed by the United States Government, and has been repeatedly so stated, that the restoration of Austria as a state liberated from German domination in accordance with international commitment involved the restoration of the whole state and not merely a part thereof.

The United States, likewise, has never concealed, nor deviated from, its intention to uphold the principle of no reparations from Austria. The Governments of the United States, U.S.S.R. and United Kingdom agreed at the Potsdam Conference "that reparations should not be exacted from Austria". The United States by many forms of material assistance has been faithful to its pledge under the Moscow Declaration to assist Austria to obtain economic security. It could not now be party to an agreement which would place Austria in economic servitude to Yugoslavia for an indefinite period.

The problem of concluding an Austrian treaty should have permitted a swift and easy solution.

Since the first meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, the United States Government has endeavored to obtain consideration of this problem. Its repeated attempts to bring about a speedy solution were consistently frustrated by the delaying tactics of the Soviet Union. When the machinery was finally established in January of 1947 to negotiate the treaty, it was believed that a fair and just solution would be achieved. Now, after almost a year and a half of continuous negotiations, and more than 325 meetings of the representatives of the Four Powers, we again find the solution deferred.

The conclusion of an acceptable Austrian treaty permitting a reestablished Austrian state to develop freely on a sound basis is regarded as essential to the peace and security of Europe. The future course of the treaty negotiations offers a test of the desire for the development of international cooperation. The machinery has been established and continues available; the issues are clear and simple; the tasks of occupation have been fulfilled; the Austrian nation three years after liberation deserves the right to manage its own affairs freely; the necessity for final settlement of the Austrian problem is long over-due. The United States Government stands ready to resume discussions whenever there is hope that the basic issues of the Austrian treaty can be resolved.

LETTER FROM THE U.S. DEPUTY ON THE AUSTRIAN TREATY NEGOTIATIONS TO THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS¹

[Released to the press May 24]

May 24, 1948

As chairman of the next meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, deputies for Austria, I am informed that the delegations are unable to remain indefinitely in London. In these circumstances, it is difficult for me to set a date for the resumption of the Austrian treaty negotiations, but I am prepared at any time to call the next meeting of the deputies as soon as possible upon receiving information that there exists a justifiable basis for continued negotiation, particularly with respect to assurances concerning the maintenance of Austria's 1937 frontiers and the principle of no reparations.

In order to ensure continuity and to facilitate communications with a view of avoiding delay in convocation of the next meeting, I am authorized to inform you that Mr. Gerald Keith, Counselor of the United States Embassy, London, has been designated to act as liaison for exchange of information with the secretariat or with the representatives of other governments. He will act in

this capacity upon my departure. I shall be grateful if you would be kind enough to inform the other deputies of this communication.

SAMUEL REBER

Letters of Credence

Costa Rica

The newly appointed Ambassador of Costa Rica, Señor Don Mario A. Esquivel, presented his credentials to the President on May 26. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 422 of May 26, 1948.

Correction

In the BULLETIN of April 25, 1948, page 541, footnote 2 should read "Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1553" instead of "1533".

¹ Printed from telegraphic text.

Greek Investigation Into Death of CBS Correspondent

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY MARSHALL

[Released to the press May 26]

The American Chargé d'Affaires at Athens, Mr. Karl L. Rankin, has reported that the Greek investigation into the tragic death of George Polk,¹ whose body was found in Salonika Bay on May 16, is being efficiently handled by the Greek police and national security agency. The two Columbia Broadcasting System representatives who are conducting an independent investigation in Salonika, Messrs. Winston Burdett and John Secondari, have also reported that they are getting the fullest cooperation of the Greek police.

The American Chargé is in constant touch with the Greek Ministers of Justice and Public Order and describes the investigation being carried out under their supervision as "vigorous and thorough". At Athens, First Secretary George Edman and Third Secretary Oliver M. Marcy have been specially designated to follow this investiga-

tion daily. At Salonika this is being done personally by the Consul General, Mr. Raleigh Gibson. The British Police Mission in Greece is also taking an active part in the investigation.

I am assured that all possible angles and motives in connection with this murder are being impartially explored. It is pointed out, however, that the circumstances of the crime render the task of investigation extremely difficult. So far, no arrests or response to the Greek Government's offer of a reward have been reported.

All information available to the Department on this subject is being communicated to a group of members of the Overseas Writers Association headed by Mr. Walter Lippman in Washington. In Greece, American correspondents who wish to observe on the spot the measures being taken to apprehend the authors of the crime are being given the full support and assistance of American officials and of the Greek Government.

TEXT OF NOTE FROM AMBASSADOR DENDRAMIS TO SECRETARY MARSHALL¹

[Released to the press May 29]

May 28, 1948

The Ambassador of Greece presents his compliments to His Excellency the Secretary of State and has the honor to inform him that the Greek Government has instructed him to report on the Polk case as follows:

The investigation of the horrible murder of George Polk continues to be vigorously prosecuted by all appropriate agencies of the Greek State. A summary of the activities to date follows:

(1) On the day of the discovery of the body at Salonika, the Prime Minister, Mr. Sophoulis, and the Minister of Press and Information, Mr. Alianos, issued statements condemning the crime and promising a full and exhaustive enquiry.

(2) On the day following the discovery of the body the Minister of Public Order, Mr. Rentis, himself proceeded to Salonika to supervise the investigation. On the same day, Mr. Rentis, in the name of the Greek State, offered a reward of 25 million drachmae for information leading to

the arrest of the guilty. Mr. Rentis has since remained in close personal touch with the progress of the investigation.

(3) The investigation is proceeding with every facility of the State at work. No possibilities of guilt are excluded.

(4) Greek authorities are also working closely with the other foreign agencies on the case. These include: two special American representatives of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Mr. Burdett and Mr. Secondari; the American Mission for Aid to Greece, the American Consulate-General, the American Embassy and the British Police Mission. With the exception of the CBS representatives, who arrived later, all agencies listed above have been working on the case since the beginning.

The Greek Ambassador has been asked to assure the Secretary of State that the utmost effort is being made by the Greek Government and other interested agencies in this tragic case which has shocked Greek public opinion. He has also been instructed to assure the Secretary that justice will be done regardless of what the investigation may disclose.

¹ BULLETIN of May 30, 1948, p. 713.

² Printed from telegraphic text.

STATEMENT BY THE GREEK UNDER SECRETARY FOR PRESS AND INFORMATION

[Released to the press May 26]

In view of the great interest of the American journalistic world in the case of the murder of George Polk, the Greek Government would welcome and facilitate any correspondent or committee of correspondents from America to ascertain on the spot the urgent steps taken by the Greek Government in carrying out a thorough

investigation, in every direction, with a view to discovering those guilty and punishing them most severely.

Such correspondents or a committee of correspondents will at the same time have the opportunity of ascertaining, while in Greece, that there exists a regime of absolute freedom of press for every journalist.

Lebanon Rejects U.S. Demand for Release of American Citizens

NOTE FROM THE LEBANESE FOREIGN OFFICE TO THE AMERICAN MINISTER TO LEBANON¹

[Released to the press May 23]

May 22, 1948

Referring to your letter No. 151 of May 20, 1948, relative to the landing and internment, effected May 19, of a certain number of Jewish immigrants traveling on board the *S. S. Marine Carp*, I have the honor to inform you that this measure has been taken by the military authorities in view of the safety of the Lebanese Army of Occupation in Palestine and for order and security in Palestine territory occupied.

The said passengers were traveling to Haifa, not provided with regular immigration permits, and at a time when this port, reserved for operations of embarkation of British forces, has been declared a zone forbidden to all landing of passengers.

It was manifest that the able-bodied men among these illegal immigrants were going, as some thousands of others who have preceded them, to join elements of trouble and anarchy in Palestine and to attack the Lebanese forces which have intervened with other Arab forces to reestablish order and put an end to the violence and acts of terrorism committed by the Zionists.

You know, in effect, Mr. Minister, that the Lebanese Army and the other Arab armies have intervened in Palestine, with the consent and at the request of the large majority of its inhabitants, to protect those inhabitants against the crimes of a Zionist minority constituted into terrorist organizations—Haganah, Irgun or Stern—reinforced by a continuous illegal immigration which has been admitted by the Minister of Immigration of the so-called state of Israel.

These organizations whose origin dates back well beyond the UNO recommendation for partition were created under the mandate outside the law and have been responsible for the most atro-

cious crimes perpetrated in Palestine, Egypt, Italy, the Orient, Britain, and which the Jewish Agency itself had discredited before the so-called Jewish state had assembled these organizations and had incorporated them in its armed forces.

Their ill deeds which have gone beyond national limits and have affected the most sacred rights of humanity—such as at Deir, Yassin, Haifa or Tiberias—have justified intervention of the Arab Governments. The latter have moreover been injured in their essential right: violation of frontiers before all intervention; attack upon Arab consular representations at Jerusalem of which the Secretary of the Lebanese Consulate was a victim and especially the will for expansion into aggressive Zionism expressed by the words of the Ben Gurion or of one Shertok before they were chief of government of [and] Minister of Foreign Affairs of the pretended state of Israel.

It is in fact to fulfil the mission arising from the intervention in Palestine which has been forced upon the Lebanese Army and to secure its own security and that of Arab armies that it has had to take the measure in question.

I should, moreover, point out that certain of the illegal Jewish immigrants debarked and bearers of American passports far from claiming American citizenship and protection, and gloried in obedience to the state of Israel.

The able-bodied men of every nationality so debarked and detained, numbering 69, follow the list of names attached.² They have been directed to the detention camp of Baalbek where they are lodged and fed in care of Lebanese authorities and can be visited at any time by the representatives of the American Legation.

¹ Printed from telegraphic text.

² BULLETIN of May 30, 1948, p. 712.

Extension of the Trade Agreements Act

EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVE DOUGHTON AND SECRETARY MARSHALL

[Released to the press May 24]

The Secretary of State released on May 24 the exchange of correspondence with Representative Doughton, ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. Representative Doughton wrote to the Secretary of State requesting an expression of views regarding H.R. 6556, a bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act.

May 21, 1948

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY:

As you know, H.R. 6556, which provides for an extension of the Trade Agreements Act for one year, makes drastic changes in the procedure for negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements.

In your opinion, in view of the scope of the proposed changes, would the best interests of the Nation be better served if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act were permitted to expire than for H.R. 6556 to be enacted in its present form?

Your expeditious reply to this inquiry will be of great value to, and much appreciated by, the Minority Members in their consideration of the bill in the House of Representatives. It is now contemplated that the bill will be debated in the House on Wednesday, May 26, 1948.

With expressions of high esteem, I am
Sincerely yours,

R. L. DOUGHTON

May 24, 1948

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON:

I have your letter of May 21 asking my opinion whether our national interests would be better served by permitting the expiration of the Trade Agreements Act than by the passage of HR-6556 with its drastic changes in procedure.

The Trade Agreements Program has been a cornerstone of our foreign economic policy for fourteen years. Through it we have exercised a significant part of our leadership in world economic affairs.

The principle of the Trade Agreements Program is incorporated in the European Cooperation Act of 1948. The present Congress so provided because it recognized that European recovery waits upon a great expansion in European production for which there must be markets and that

markets in turn wait upon a lowering of barriers to trade among the European countries and between such countries and other nations.

Although HR-6556 extends the Trade Agreements Act for one year, it does so with such crippling amendments that only a shadow of the original Act is preserved while its substance is destroyed.

HR-6556 provides for a cumbersome procedure which would involve interminable delays and serious questions of responsibility.

It substitutes a single Agency (Tariff Commission) for the present Trade Agreements Committee composed of representatives of seven government agencies all directly interested in the tariff, as the body responsible for investigation and recommendation to the President.

Most serious of all it, in effect, makes pure protection the sole criterion for tariff action and forbids the Tariff Commission from participating in deliberations of the Trade Agreements Committee in which, under the present system, other important aspects of the national interest are also taken into account.

In my judgment enactment of HR-6556 would make the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program unworkable.

Under the circumstances I think our national interests would be better served to permit the Trade Agreements Act to expire than for HR-6556 to be enacted. But it is my earnest hope that this Congress will extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for three years without the proposed crippling amendments.

Faithfully yours,



THE CONGRESS

Conventions and Recommendations Formulated at the Twenty-Ninth Session of the International Labor Conference: Message from the President of the United States transmitting authentic texts of three conventions and two recommendations formulated at the twenty-ninth session of the International Labor Conference, held at Montreal from September 19 to October 9, 1946. H. Doc. 603, 80th Cong., 2d sess. 29 pp.

Department of State Bulletin

Addresses on U.N. Appeal for Children and Relations With U.S.S.R.

On May 25, Secretary Marshall made an address on behalf of American Overseas Aid and United Nations Appeal for Children at Madison Square Garden, New York City; for the text of this address, see Department of State press release 406 of May 25, 1948.

On May 26 Charles E. Bohlen, Counselor, Department of State, made an address at the commencement exercises at the University of Arizona, Tucson; for the text of this address see *Problems of American Foreign Relations* (Department of State publication 3169).

Officials From Chile, Brazil, and Argentina Awarded Grants-In-Aid

The Department of State has awarded grants-in-aid to the following:

Regina M. Real, Curator of the Museum of Fine Arts of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, for a three months' stay for the purpose of visiting museums and observing museum administration in this country.

Edwin Ihl, Entomology Specialist of the Compañía Salitrera de Rarapaca y Antofagasta, Temuco, Chile, for a three months' study of beetle control work in the United States. His work will be carried on in cooperation with the Smithsonian Institution.

Enrique Romero Brest, Inspector of Physical Education of the Ministry of Education of Argentina, and President of the Association of Physical Education Teachers of that country, to study physical-education methods in use in the schools of this country.

THE DEPARTMENT

Appointment of Officers

J. Burke Knapp as Director of the Office of Financial and Development Policy, effective May 24, 1948.

John Hilldring Declines Appointment as Special Assistant

[Released to the press May 26]

On May 26 the Secretary of State was advised by Major General John Hilldring that he is unable to take up his duties as Special Assistant on Palestine Affairs for reasons of ill health.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Consular Offices

The American Consulate at Elisabethville, Belgian Congo, was opened to the public May 12, 1948.

Large Dams—Continued from page 737

Walker R. Young, Chief Engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior

Members of the Delegation

E. Robert de Luccia, Chief, Bureau of Power, Federal Power Commission

B. F. Jakobsen, Chief, Plans and Specifications Section, South Pacific Division, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army

T. A. Middlebrooks, Chief, Soils Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army

Clarence Rawhouser, Engineer, Dams Division, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior

Dr. Karl Terzaghi, Consulting Engineer, Graduate School, Harvard University

Carl P. Vetter, Chief, Office of River Control of the Colorado River, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior

The purpose of the Congress is to discuss and demonstrate recent developments in the building of large dams. Invitations have been issued to the 20 governments which are members of the International Commission on Large Dams.

Dams higher than the Hoover (Boulder) Dam, the highest in the world, are now being planned in both Europe and India. The Congress will review the subject and attempt to draw some conclusions as to the practicability of dams of this size. The Congress will also discuss experiences arising from the testing and the actual use of special cements for large dams. Other topics to be considered are a critical exposition of the measurement of uplift pressures and stresses arising therefrom, research methods and instruments for the measure of stresses and deformation in earth and concrete dams, and the most recent precautions to avoid the formation of pipings.

The first two days of the Congress will be devoted to the presentation of reports and to discussions, while the following five days will be spent on a study tour of a number of dams and hydroelectric power plants and of one of Sweden's large industries.

The First Congress was held at Stockholm in 1933, simultaneously with the sectional meeting of the World Power Conference. The Second Congress was held at Washington, in 1936, simultaneously with the plenary meeting of the World Power Conference.

The International Commission on Large Dams, which arranges for the congresses, was constituted in 1928 for the purpose of promoting research in matters connected with large dams and of collecting experiences in regard to their design, construction, maintenance, and operation. The member nations of the Commission function through national committees. The United States Committee on Large Dams is headed by Michael W. Straus, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

Contents

The U.N. and Specialized Agencies

Genocide: Report of the U.S. Representative on ECOSOC Committee	723
Accomplishments of UNESCO. By George V. Allen	727
Security Council Action on Palestine:	
Cease-Fire Order	729
Four-Week Truce	729
U.S. Asks Jewish and Arab States To Cooperate in Cease-Fire Order	729
U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography	730
The United States in the United Nations	731
International Highway System Designated	737
Addresses on U.N. Appeal for Children and Relations With U.S.S.R.	751

General Policy

Firm and Determined Course for the Democracies. By George C. Marshall	744
U.S. Answers Soviet Protest Regarding Activities of American Aircraft Near Japan	746
Letters of Credence: Costa Rica	747
Greek Investigation Into Death of CBS Correspondent:	
Statement by Secretary Marshall	748
Text of Note From Ambassador Dendramis to Secretary Marshall	748
Statement by the Greek Under Secretary	749
Lebanon Rejects U.S. Demand for Release of American Citizens. Note From the Lebanese Foreign Office to the American Minister to Lebanon	749

Treaty Information

U.S. Proposes Conference on Questions Regarding Danube River:	
Exchange of Views With the U.K., French, and Soviet Governments	735
Decisions at the C.F.M. meetings in December 1946	736
Statement by Secretary Marshall	736

Treaty Information—Continued

Soviet Violations of Treaty Obligations: Document Submitted by the Department of State to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations	738
Suspension of Austrian Treaty Negotiations:	
General Statement	746
Letter From the U.S. Deputy on the Austrian Treaty Negotiations to the Secretary General of the Council of Foreign Ministers	747
Extension of Trade Agreements Act. Exchange of Correspondence Between Representative Doughton and Secretary Marshall	750

Economic Affairs

U.S. Delegation to Second International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering	737
U.S. Delegation to Third International Congress on Large Dams	737

International Information and Cultural Affairs

Officials From Chile, Brazil, and Argentina Awarded Grants-in-Aid	751
---	-----

Calendar of International Meetings

The Department

Appointment of Officers	751
John Hildring Declines Appointment as Special Assistant	751

The Foreign Service

Consular Offices	751
----------------------------	-----

The Congress	730, 750
------------------------	----------

Contents of Documents and State Papers for June 1948

- ★ The Interim Committee or "The Little Assembly"
- ★ Arms for the United Nations
- ★ Compulsory Jurisdiction of the Court
- ★ Third Anniversary of the U.N. Charter
- ★ U.N. Conference on Freedom of Information